further on this severe inquisitorial road, why not go the whole way and turn back to the laws of Christian V's time, where it was declared that anyone who made fraudulent declarations should have his right hand cut off and stuck on a stake? Would it not be best to consider that and bring these stakes into Parliament Yard? Thus we can see who the really guilty are.

The Finance Minister, Mr. Thorkil Kristensen, objected that the land to-day had not the same dominating place in economic life as it had in days of old; that people to-day were for the most part only very indirectly connected with the land; that their whole economic existence was determined more or less by money which was dependent on many other factors than land—such as machines, ships, crops, means of transport, etc., and the whole modern productive apparatus.

Dr. Starcke replied: By land is meant, I understand, the land in its full and comprehensive sense, the Globe and its raw materials. We are free to include the sun and the moon. The fundamental difference between the land and the machines, ships, money and whatnot which the Minister says now play their role is that we cannot produce land and it has not been made by any man. We are compensated by the fact that it is everlasting. But all that is called machinery, ships, tools and implements and goods; all of it is produced by man. We can produce more and we can produce it pretty well without limit; but by contrast none of it is durable. Moth and rust devour it. There were no houses, machines or ships when our forefathers first settled here. All are things that man has built and (if they were destroyed) we can make them again if we have access to land and to nature. But what happens if the land is closed against us and we are barred from the food and the things which must be produced from the land? Mankind dies.

I spoke of land in its widest sense. (The Finance Minister: You took in also the sun and the moon!) I did include the sun and the moon, and if the Finance Minister wishes, I will take in the stars as well. What could our agriculture do without the sun, what could it do without the land? Could it carry on merely with machines, with technique, with banknotes, as the Minister seems to think? Of course, technique and machines and all the rest play an increasing role, but they have in high degree taken part in the increase of land values. Go back to the days of the great land reforms [toward the end of the 18th century] and see how the value of land has risen since. That will give an idea just what increasing population and increased technique have meant in the matter of land prices. As for the tax laws of 1903, which the Finance Minister said were his Party's good gift to the Danish people, I remind him that the abolition of the old Hartkorn taxes was mainly the work of Ole Hansen and Alberti; and that in 1926 Ole Hansen stood at the Liberty Monument [in Copenhagen, an open air meeting in connection with the International Conference for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade] and admitted the mistake that was made in transforming the Hartkorn taxes into a property tax and building up the progressive taxes we now have. He said we should have transformed the Hartkorn taxes into a land-value tax.

In the third reading of the Bill, Dr. Starcke said: I regard Power as being much the same as Force, but Power is a Force without a plus or minus symbol. If we put Power behind that which is right, we will reach Justice. But if we put Power behind what is wrong, we arrive at Violence. And if we now, as in the present proposal, put the full power of the State behind a tax system which is unjust, we establish the rule of Violence. We come, in fact, to something akin to the German methods which we have seen developed in these recent years. We are getting back to the Machiavellian view that the people are a set of rascals, and that means the death of popular government. But the people are not rascals. On the other hand they are likely to lose respect for those whom they have elected to give them laws. The danger is that they will lose respect for the laws themselves, and the laws will be evaded because they are not in harmony with the people's sense of justice.

If we based our tax system now and in the future upon a valuation of what the land is worth as we have it from the hand of nature and the hand of God; if we based it on the value which, as the result of the life of society, its industrial advance, its judicial system and the whole make-up of civilisation is crystallised in the value of land—that value can neither be hidden nor can anyone play tricks with it.

"INTELLIGENT SOCIALIST PLANNING"

IN THE debate, May 27, on the Government's proposal to bring certain sections of the iron and steel industries under public ownership, Mr. Hugh Dalton arguing for nationalisation, gave the South African example. In 1934 the South African Iron and Steel Corporation was set up with 90 per cent. of the total issued capital held by the Government. It was not until the Government, he said, took over the show, took it in hand and "bucked it up," that economic production really started.

Mr. Lyttleton intervened with the pertinent question, asking what protective duties were imposed on steel by the South African Government. Mr. Dalton said they were undoubtedly high, but they were totally irrelevant to the argument he was adducing that this governmental enterprise had made "a very great contribution in arms" during the war. But that in itself was an irrelevant argument, if it was meant to claim that private enterprise would have made less of it, as to which there is no possibility of proof.

The next interruption brought more light on the subject. Mr. Eccles said that the Chancellor must know that railway freights over those enormous distances make all the difference between being able to carry on a steel industry there or otherwise; also that the railways are State owned and further that the freights were changed in order to help the iron and steel industry when it was nationalised. Therefore the industry is heavily subsidised inside South Africa.

To which Mr. Dalton replied: *"It all seems to me like very intelligent Socialist planning."*

Sir Andrew Duncan was the other highlight in the debate. He spoke for the protectionist policy which had built up the combine and acclaimed the tariffs imposed in 1932 for what they had done to put the industry on its feet. Since then there had been orderly marketing, as he called it. His admissions that a private monopoly had been established were cleverly exploited by Mr. Dalton, who said that Sir Andrew had "taken them half-way along the road to Socialism" and maintained that if a monopoly did exist it was time it was taken over by the State.

Notice the logical outcome of the Tory protectionist policy exposed by the Tories themselves and the conjunction of Socialist and Tory in a closed economy bolstered by tariffs and special privilege.

In answer to a question on March 11 last, the Minister of Health, Mr. Bevan, gave particulars from which it is possible to compare the extent of house-building during the years 1923 to 1939 under local authority schemes and private enterprise respectively. The figures are:

Under local authority schemes: 1,000,328, of which 920,939 were assisted out of public funds.

Under private enterprise: 2,894,951, of which 388,570 were assisted out of public funds and 2,507,381 were not so assisted.